

STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

1. An interview was conducted between Examiner Venkatesh Haliyur and Applicant's Undersigned Representative, Scott Davison, on July 20, 2010.

During the interview, the Applicant's Undersigned Representative discussed the overall concept of the embodiments of the invention, including how the communication between the various communication elements takes place. The Examiner discussed several proposed amendments to the claims in order to correct antecedent basis issues, and the Applicant indicated that the claims would be reviewed in order to correct these issues in the next Amendment.

2. An interview was conducted between Examiner Venkatesh Haliyur and Applicant's Undersigned Representative, Scott Davison, on October 14, 2010.

During the interview, the Applicant's Undersigned Representative presented arguments indicating that the instant rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Barber (US 7,262,702) was insufficient, as Barber failed to teach or disclose the elements of claims 1 and 10 cited by the Examiner. The Examiner clarified the arguments in the Office Action on p. 4 and indicated that he is actually citing to the resistive members 455 in Fig. 16 as disclosing the communication elements connected to the first and second conductive layers 454a and 454b. The Examiner further clarified that he is citing to the sensors 894 as showing communication elements which "initiate transmission to a second communication element," since the resistive members 455 do not teach this feature. The Applicant's Representative pointed out that the sensors 894 do not communicate with each other and clearly do not describe that they are "operative to control a voltage between the first conductive layer and the second conductive layer," as recited in claims

1 and 10. The Examiner indicated that these arguments should overcome the rejection of claims 1 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

The Examiner requested that any response include amendments to the claims to overcome the rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 112 discussed on pp. 4-5 of the Office Action. The Applicant's Representative indicated that amendments to the claims would be submitted.

It is respectfully submitted that the instant STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW complies with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §§1.2 and 1.133 and MPEP §713.04.

It is believed that no petition or fee is required. However, if the USPTO deems otherwise, Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee, except for the Issue Fee, for such extension is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-4880.